IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

| STATE OF OKLAHOMA, et al., |) |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Plaintiff, |) |
| v. |) Case No. 05-CV-00329-GKF(PJC) |
| TYSON FOODS, INC., et al., |) |
| Defendants. |) |

STATE OF OKLAHOMA'S REPLY IN FURTHER SUPPORT OF ITS MOTION IN LIMINE TO PRECLUDE DEFENDANTS FROM REFERRING TO THIS ACTION AS ANYTHING OTHER THAN "THE STATE'S" LAWSUIT [DKT #2406]

Plaintiff, the State of Oklahoma ("the State"), respectfully submits this reply in further support of its "Motion *in Limine* to Preclude Defendants from Referring To This Action as Anything Other Than 'the State's' Lawsuit." [DKT #2406]

The State has sought an order precluding Defendants from referring to this action as anything other than "the State's" lawsuit. Specifically, the State has sought an order precluding Defendants from: (1) referring to this lawsuit as "the Attorney General's lawsuit," "General Edmondson's lawsuit," or any similar phrases; and (2) referring to the party plaintiff to this lawsuit as anything other than "the State" or "Plaintiff." Defendants oppose the State's Motion, attempting to assign significance to the fact that it was the Attorney General who filed this lawsuit on behalf of the State. *See, e.g.*, Response, p. 8 ("That this lawsuit originated in the attorney general's office . . . is and has always been, an important aspect of the Poultry Defendants' defense"). This is improper as a matter of law, and therefore the State's Motion must be granted.

This is the State's lawsuit. The State is the sole plaintiff in this lawsuit. The Attorney General is not a party plaintiff in this lawsuit. See 74 Okla. Stat. § 18b(A)(1)-(3); see also, e.g., United States v. Northside Realty Assocs., Inc., 324 F. Supp. 287, 291 (N.D. Ga. 1971); State ex rel. Norvell v. Credit Bureau of Albuquerque, Inc., 514 P.2d 40, 43 (N.M. 1973). Rather, the Attorney General is the State's lawyer. See 74 Okla. Stat. § 18b(A)(1)-(3).

The Oklahoma Legislature has specifically charged the Attorney General with the duty "[t]o initiate or appear in any action in which the interests of the state or the people of the state are at issue[.]" See 74 Okla. Stat. § 18b(A)(3). Further, the Oklahoma Legislature has specifically assigns the Attorney General the duty "[t]o appear for the state and prosecute . . . all actions and proceedings in any of the federal courts in which the state is interested as a party."

See 74 Okla. Stat. § 18b(A)(2). The Oklahoma Legislature's rationale for centralizing the State's litigation responsibilities with the Attorney General is not at all difficult to discern. As explained in the federal context, "[t]he Supreme Court has recognized that the main purposes of centralizing litigation responsibility in the Justice Department is to assure that the United States should speak with one voice 'that reflects not the parochial interests of a particular agency, but the common interests of the Government and therefore of all the people." Town of Norfolk & Town of Walpole v. United States Army Corps of Engineers, 968 F.2d 1438, 1459 (1st Cir. 1992) (citing United States v. Providence Journal Co., 485 U.S. 693 (1988)).

Defendants have cited <u>no</u> legal authority supporting the proposition that this case is anything other than <u>the State's</u> case. To characterize this case as "the attorney general's lawsuit" is legally incorrect. And to characterize this case as "the lawsuit brought by the attorney

Despite the fact that this Court has already ruled that "[t]he state, not the Attorney General is the real party in interest and is the Plaintiff in this action, *see* DKT #1062, pp. 2-3, Defendants continue to ignore this order and persist in referring to the State in this action as "Plaintiffs" rather than "Plaintiff." *See*, *e.g.*, Response, p. 3.

general," "the lawsuit filed by the attorney general" or any other similar phrase is an improper attempt to personalize a case brought on behalf of the State. Such references would be irrelevant, unduly prejudicial and confusing and should be excluded under Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 and / or 403. This is the State's lawsuit, and it should be referred to as such and in no other manner. To the extent they believe that a state employee has a view that conflicts with the State's theory of the case, Defendants are free to attempt to elicit that testimony at trial.² But in eliciting such testimony, Defendants cannot argue or otherwise attempt to suggest that this is anything other than the State's case.

Conclusion

The State's motion in limine for an order precluding Defendants from referring to this action as anything other than the State's lawsuit should be granted.

Through selective use of quotations, Defendants seek to create the impression that various state officials do not support this lawsuit. See, e.g., Response, p. 7 ("These details support the idea that Mr. Edmondson initiated this lawsuit without the full support of relevant Oklahoma agencies and officials"). Not only is it legally irrelevant, see supra, but also such argument is factually inaccurate. For example, Steve Thompson, executive director of ODEQ, testified not only that "[i]n the time frame that the lawsuit was filed, we met with the governor, and we agreed that this was the State of Oklahoma's lawsuit," but also that "the governor advised the agencies that he was in full concurrence with the suit, and that as agencies of state government, we would be expected to be a part of that suit." See Ex. 1 (4/7/09 S. Thompson Depo., pp. 12 & 14). Likewise, Terry Peach, Secretary of Agriculture, testified not only that "the state of Oklahoma" is the plaintiff in this lawsuit, but also that if it were up to him there would be a lawsuit between the State and Defendants. See Ex. 2 (4/10/09 T. Peach Depo., pp. 101-102) ("Yes, there might be [a lawsuit] because we need to make sure that all the laws are followed in the state of Oklahoma"). Through similar selective use of deposition quotations in their Response, Defendants also attempt to create the impression that Oklahoma agencies responsible for promulgating and enforcing regulations regarding the use of poultry waste and its effects on the environment and for ensuring the public health and safety do not view poultry litter as a substance harmful to the environment or human health. As will be shown at trial, that is not the case.

W.A. Drew Edmondson OBA #2628 ATTORNEY GENERAL Kelly H. Foster OBA #17067 ASSISTANT ATTORNEYS GENERAL State of Oklahoma 313 N.E. 21st St. Oklahoma City, OK 73105 (405) 521-3921

M. David Riggs OBA #7583
Joseph P. Lennart OBA #5371
Richard T. Garren OBA #3253
Sharon K. Weaver OBA #19010
Robert A. Nance OBA #6581
D. Sharon Gentry OBA #15641
David P. Page OBA #6852
RIGGS, ABNEY, NEAL, TURPEN,
ORBISON & LEWIS
502 West Sixth Street
Tulsa, OK 74119
(918) 587-3161

Louis W. Bullock OBA #1305 Robert M. Blakemore OBA 18656 BULLOCK, BULLOCK & BLAKEMORE 110 West Seventh Street Suite 707 Tulsa OK 74119 (918) 584-2001

Frederick C. Baker (admitted *pro hac vice*) Elizabeth Claire Xidis (admitted *pro hac vice*) MOTLEY RICE LLC 28 Bridgeside Boulevard Mount Pleasant, SC 29465 (843) 216-9280

/s/ Ingrid L. Moll

William H. Narwold (admitted *pro hac vice*) Ingrid L. Moll (admitted *pro hac vice*) Mathew P. Jasinski (admitted *pro hac vice*) MOTLEY RICE LLC 20 Church Street, 17th Floor Hartford, CT 06103 (860) 882-1678

Jonathan D. Orent (admitted *pro hac vice*) Michael G. Rousseau (admitted *pro hac vice*) Fidelma L. Fitzpatrick (admitted *pro hac vice*) MOTLEY RICE LLC 321 South Main Street Providence, RI 02940 (401) 457-7700

Attorneys for the State of Oklahoma

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 4th day of September, 2009, I electronically transmitted the above and foregoing pleading to the Clerk of the Court using the ECF System for filing and a transmittal of a Notice of Electronic Filing to the following ECF registrants:

| W. A. Drew Edmondson, Attorney General | fc_docket@oag.ok.gov | |
|------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| Kelly H. Foster, Assistant Attorney General | kelly_foster@oag.ok.gov | |
| | | |
| M. David Riggs | driggs@riggsabney.com | |
| Joseph P. Lennart | jlennart@riggsabney.com | |
| Richard T. Garren | rgarren@riggsabney.com | |
| Sharon K. Weaver | sweaver@riggsabney.com | |
| Robert A. Nance | rnance@riggsabney.com | |
| D. Sharon Gentry | sgentry@riggsabney.com | |
| David P. Page | dpage@riggsabney.com | |
| RIGGS, ABNEY, NEAL, TURPEN, ORBISON & | LEWIS | |
| | | |
| Louis Werner Bullock | lbullock@bullock-blakemore.com | |
| Robert M. Blakemore | bblakemore@bullock-blakemore.com | |
| BULLOCK, BULLOCK & BLAKEMORE | | |
| | | |
| Frederick C. Baker | fbaker@motleyrice.com | |
| Elizabeth Claire Xidis | cxidis@motleyrice.com | |
| William H. Narwold | bnarwold@motleyrice.com | |
| Ingrid L. Moll | imoll@motleyrice.com | |
| Mathew P. Jasinski | mjasinski@motleyrice.com | |
| Jonathan D. Orent | jorent@motleyrice.com | |
| Michael G. Rousseau | mrousseau@motleyrice.com | |
| Fidelma L. Fitzpatrick | ffitzpatrick@motleyrice.com | |
| MOTLEY RICE LLC | | |
| Counsel for State of Oklahoma | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| William D. Perrine | wperrine@pmrlaw.net | |
| Robert P. Redemann | rredemann@pmrlaw.net | |
| Gregory A. Mueggenborg | gmueggenborg@pmrlaw.net | |
| PERRINE, MCGIVERN, REDEMANN, REID, BA | RRY & TAYLOR, P.L.L.C. | |
| | | |
| David C. Senger | david@cgmlawok.com | |
| | | |
| Robert E Sanders | rsanders@youngwilliams.com | |
| Edwin Stephen Williams | steve.williams@youngwilliams.com | |
| YOUNG WILLIAMS P.A. | | |
| Counsel for Cal-Maine Farms, Inc and Cal-Maine Foods, Inc. | | |

LATHROP & GAGE LC

| FELLERS, SNIDER, BLANKENSHIP, BAILEY | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|--|
| & TIPPENS, PC | | |
| | | |
| William A. Waddell, Jr. | waddell@fec.net | |
| David E. Choate | dchoate@fec.net | |
| FRIDAY, ELDREDGE & CLARK, LLP | | |
| Counsel for Arkansas Farm Bureau Federation | | |
| | | |
| | 11.0 1.1111 | |
| Barry Greg Reynolds | reynolds@titushillis.com | |
| Jessica E. Rainey | jrainey@titushillis.com | |
| TITUS, HILLIS, REYNOLDS, LOVE, | | |
| DICKMAN & MCCALMON | | |
| | | |
| Nikaa Baugh Jordan | njordan@lightfootlaw.com | |
| William S. Cox, III | wcox@lightfootlaw.com | |
| LIGHTFOOT, FRANKLIN & WHITE, LLC | | |
| Counsel for American Farm Bureau and National Cattlemen's Beef Association | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| Duane L. Berlin | dberlin@levberlin.com | |
| LEV & BERLIN PC | | |
| Counsel for Council of American Survey Research Organizations & American Association for | | |
| Public Opinion Research | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| A. Diane Hammons, Attorney General, Cherokee | diane-hammons@cherokee.org | |
| Nation | | |
| Sara Elizabeth Hill | sara-hill@cherokee.org | |
| Counsel for the Cherokee Nation | | |

Also on this 4th day of September, 2009 I mailed a copy of the above and foregoing pleading to:

Thomas C Green -- via email: tcgreen@sidley.com Sidley, Austin, Brown & Wood LLP

Dustin McDaniel Justin Allen Office of the Attorney General (Little Rock) 323 Center St, Ste 200 Little Rock, AR 72201-2610

Steven B. Randall

58185 County Rd 658 Kansas, Ok 74347

Cary Silverman -- via email: csilverman@shb.com Victor E Schwartz Shook Hardy & Bacon LLP (Washington DC)

> <u>/s/ Ingrid L. Moll</u> Ingrid L. Moll